REMARKS

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1 – 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brauch et al.

5   Response

Claim 1

Brauch et al. claim a method and apparatus for performing a test on a memory in order to determine if said memory has associated defects (Col.2, lines 26 – 35). Claim 1 similarly performs a test on a memory, but further sets 'a plurality of operating

10   environments for a condition to be tested', tests the memory 'under the plurality of operating environments' and then compares 'the recorded results for the plurality of operating environments'. As stated in the preamble of Claim 1, this method is for 'determining the integrity of a memory', therefore it can be inferred that the final step of 'comparing the recorded results' is to determine the integrity of the memory. As defined

15   in the specification of the present invention, a memory with integrity means that in said memory "the number of defects and their respective locations are consistent under all the operating environments an electronic device is intended to perform under" (paragraph [0005] of the present application). There is no disclosure given by Brauch for testing a memory under a 'plurality of operating environments' and then 'comparing the recorded

20   results'. Therefore Brauch never determines whether a memory has integrity, but only determines if the number of defects found in a memory is below a certain number, whereas the present invention determines a memory has integrity if the number of defects under each operating environment is the same, a conclusion that can only be made by 'comparing the recorded results'. Therefore, applicant asserts that the method of Claim 1

is neither taught nor suggested by Brauch et al. Reconsideration of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3

5   Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on Claim 1, and should be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claims 4 and 5

Claims 4 and 5 are dependent upon Claim 1, which claims 'testing the memory under the plurality of operating environments', where claims 4 and 5 define the condition to be tested as supply voltage and temperature respectively. Therefore, supply voltage or

10   temperature are varied to give the plurality of operating environments, and in the testing step the results are compared with each other, as claimed in Claim 1: 'comparing the recorded results for the plurality of operating environments'. As Brauch only performs the memory test for a fixed voltage supply condition and/or a fixed temperature condition (i.e. a single operating environment), the results will only be compared with an expected result

15   (Brauch et al. Fig.3). Therefore, applicant asserts that the claimed features of claims 4 and 5 are neither taught nor suggested by Brauch et al, and therefore claims 4 and 5 should be found allowable.

Claims 6 and 9

Claims 6 and 9 are dependent upon Claim 1, and should be allowed if Claim 1 is

20   found allowable.

Claim 7

Claim 7 has the limitation of 'recording the number of defects located in the memory', wherein the term 'recording' necessarily covers storing the number of defects. Furthermore, to record the number of defects, the number must be known, therefore a

3

counting of defects is essential. Brauch only produces a bitmap of the location of failed cells (Col.3, lines 44 – 48) but does not record (count then store) the number of memory defects. Therefore Claim 7 should be found allowable over the prior art. Furthermore, Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1, and should be found allowable if Claim 1 is found

5   allowable.

Claims 8 and 10

Claims 8 and 10 respectively teach determining if the number and position of defects are the same in each operating environment. As Brauch does not teach testing a memory under a plurality of operating environments as claimed in Claim 1, only one testing result

10   is produced, and therefore no comparing step can take place. Furthermore, as claims 8 and 10 are dependent on Claim 1, applicant asserts that claims 8 and 10 should be found allowable.

Claim 11

Claim 11 recites 'testing a memory under a first operating environment' and 'testing

15   the memory under a second operating environment'. As such a limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Brauch, who only teaches performing a single memory test under a single operating environment, applicant asserts that Claim 11 should be found allowable over Brauch.

Claims 12 and 13

20   Claims 12 and 13 are dependent upon Claim 11, and should be allowed if Claim 11 is found allowable.

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on Claim 11, which has the limitation of 'testing a

memory under a first operating environment' and 'testing the memory under a second operating environment'. Claims 14 and 15 respectively define that the difference of the first and second operating environments are supply voltage and temperature. As Brauch only teaches testing a memory under a single operating environment, applicant asserts

5   that claims 14 and 15 should be found allowable over the prior art.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

10   Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu   Date: _____02/05/2007_____

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

15   Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.

20   is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)